

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

REGIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA
SEPTEMBER 15, 2000

Views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision unless so designated by other official documentation.

September 2000

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS REGIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES

**ANCHORAGE, ALASKA
SEPTEMBER 15, 2000**

by

Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd.
6352 South U.S. Highway 51
P.O. Box 1316
Carbondale, IL 62903
(618) 549-2832

A Report Submitted to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Institute for Water Resources
7701 Telegraph Road
Alexandria, VA 22315-3868

under

Task Order #25
Contract No. DACW72-99-D-0005

September 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Regional Listening Sessions Meeting Notes – Anchorage, Alaska	1
Welcoming Remarks.....	1
Session Objectives	2
Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1 st Group Discussion)	4
Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2 nd Group Discussion)	6
Challenge A – Environmental Restoration	7
Challenge D – Lack of Environmental/Engineering Data	8
Challenge B – Modify Cost/Benefit Ratio	9
Closing Remarks and Adjournment	9
Appendix A Transcription of Comments Regarding Identified Challenges	A-1
Appendix B Submitted Public Statements and Materials	B-1

REGIONAL LISTENING SESSIONS MEETING NOTES – ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

The notes provided below document the main points that were offered during the Listening Session in Anchorage, Alaska on September 15, 2000. The notes highlight and summarize the key topics and issues that were discussed at the meeting. Selected attachments are provided in this document.

Water plays a major role in how we live and work. As steward of America's water resources for more than 200 years, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has begun a dialogue with the American public, stakeholders, customers, and government agencies at all levels about the water resources challenges that lie ahead. The Corps is conducting 14 regional public listening sessions throughout the United States between June and November of 2000 to provide citizens the opportunity to voice concerns about pressing water resources problems, opportunities, and needs impacting their lives, communities, and future sustainability. This dialogue is an integral part of the Corps' strategic planning process.

The cities where listening sessions are being conducted include St. Louis, MO; Sacramento, CA; Phoenix, AZ; Woburn, MA; Atlanta, GA; Omaha, NE; Honolulu, HI; Chicago, IL; Louisville, KY; Dallas, TX; Williamsburg, VA; New Brunswick, NJ; Anchorage, AK; and Vancouver, WA.

This report summarizes the Anchorage, Alaska listening session. This session, hosted by the Pacific Ocean Division (POD) and Alaska Engineer District, was conducted on September 15, 2000 at the Egan Convention Center in Anchorage. Approximately 16 people attended this meeting to share their views with the Corps.

The information collected from the listening sessions will be incorporated into a report assessing future national water resources needs and the gaps that must be closed to meet these needs. This report will be shared with key decision-makers within the Army and Congress to help inform their discussions about water resources issues and future investment decisions. Additionally, the report will provide a point of departure for ensuing discussions with other Federal agencies to identify common water resources issues and missions most appropriate to the roles and responsibilities of the Federal government. The information will also be incorporated into a revision of the Civil Works Program Strategic Plan.

Welcoming Remarks

Brigadier General Randal Castro, USACE Pacific Ocean Division Commander, introduced himself to the audience and welcomed everyone to the session. The division he operates in consists of four districts: Far East District, Japan District, Alaska District, and Honolulu District. He explained to the participants that the POD was responsible for military construction and civil works duties, along with other responsibilities. General Castro explained

that the Corps was in the “quality of life business.” He went on to say how the well-being of military troops is important and that the same importance is applied to the well-being of the People of the Nation. The General continued by saying the Corps is in the business to manage the Nation’s water resources. Additionally, they are called upon to assist in the Nation’s wars and respond to disasters. General Castro continued by explaining the purpose of the listening session. He explained that the Corps was conducting the session to listen to what people of the region felt are water resource needs, such as flood protection or infrastructure repair. General Castro stressed that the needs of the people in this region are important to the Corps. He explained how this region has to operate in a more specialized fashion because of its challenges such as short construction seasons, remoteness of projects, seismic activity, and environmentally sensitive concerns. General Castro emphasized that the Corps is uniquely capable of handling these challenges. The objective of the session was for the Corps to listen to the concerns participants have regarding water resources and related issues and to provide information that will assist in developing a national strategy for the water resource needs of the 21st century. General Castro explained to the participants that he likes to follow a leadership philosophy known as TIPS, where the Corps conducts communication (Talks), informs people on Corps projects (Informs), predicts the needs of resources (Predictability), and applies a level of sensitivity needed to support the Nation (Sensitivity). General Castro explained how life is a balance between a career, family, your community, the environment and a number of additional daily issues. This complex balance is also a concern of the Corps. General Castro reiterated the Corps was present to listen to the concerns of the participants. He thanked the participants for coming to the session as representatives and leaders of their communities and appreciated their participation. General Castro then introduced Mr. Jim Creighton as the session facilitator representing the contractor, Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd.

Session Objectives

After General Castro’s introduction, Mr. Creighton began by explaining his involvement in previous sessions and informed the participants that this was the 13th of 14 sessions held around the Nation. Mr. Creighton went on to say that one of the main themes that have shown up in every session was the concern of how to obtain a consensus in order to act on concerns/challenges. He explained to the participants that the session was designed to allow for all the participants to present their concerns and be involved in the session. Mr. Creighton continued by saying the session was not a typical meeting where statements are read, and that if anyone came with statements to kindly provide them to the session recorder for inclusion into the report. Mr. Creighton added, the purpose of the listening session was not to discuss specific Corps projects, and that if an audience member had concerns about a particular project, they were to speak with Mr. Steve Boardman, Assistant Chief of Project Management from the Corps, who was present at the workshop. Mr. Creighton wanted the participants to share discussion with the Corps regarding issues and concerns that were of a regional or national concern.

Mr. Creighton continued by explaining the session purpose and schedule. The first portion of session would be dedicated to participants identifying challenges they felt are important. Although the agenda was intended to serve as a general guide to the day’s activities,

the agenda could be modified at the facilitator's discretion as appropriate for the particular audience. The agenda was presented as follows:

1:00-1:10	Welcome
1:10-1:20	Overview of Workshop
1:20-2:20	Table Talk Discussions
2:20-3:25	Large Group Discussions (Plenary)
3:25-3:30	Dot Voting
3:30-3:45	Break
3:45-4:45	Small Group Refocus
4:45-5:20	Large Group Discussions (Plenary)
5:20-5:30	Closing Remarks
5:30-6:00	Informal Discussions

The Corps identified six general water resource challenges they feel are of national concern, but expected other challenges to be identified by the participants. Mr. Creighton explained that the goal of the meeting was to obtain the answers to the following four questions:

1. What are the key water resources challenges facing this region?
2. Why is it a problem, and what will be the impact?
3. What actions should be taken to respond to the challenge?
4. Who should take these actions? What should the Federal government do to address the problem?

The first task assigned to the audience was to name a group spokesperson for each table. That person would be designated to report on behalf of the entire table. Mr. Creighton went on to explain that only two members of the Corps would be sitting at each table to listen to the discussions and assist the group if asked, but that they had been instructed not to serve as the spokesperson for the table. He explained to everyone that self-adhesive challenge "stickies" could be used for listing challenges and additional comments on an individual basis and to use them for table discussion topics and inclusion on the associated challenges posted around the room.

Once the spokespersons had been chosen, two directions would be presented to the audience for them to discuss in small groups at the tables. The first direction would be to identify the water challenges that people at the table thought were important; the second direction would be to discuss why they were important. The spokesperson for each table was also instructed to create a crisp, concise statement of each challenge as identified by the group, as well as to develop a brief analysis as to why it was considered a challenge. As each spokesperson reported on the challenges generated at their table, a Corps staff member would capture the statement of each challenge and project it onto a screen for all the participants to view. Another Corps member would write out the same statement on butcher pad paper and post it for prioritizing the challenges. Once all challenges were determined, the participants would be given five red self-adhesive dots. The dots would be used to vote on the challenges each participant felt are the most important. The reason for this was so that the most important challenges could be addressed during the afternoon session. The other challenges would be

analyzed and discussed in the summary report, but because of time constraints could not be discussed in the session.

Mr. Creighton asked the participants to consolidate to three or four tables for table talk activities. Once the participants formed their table groups, one participant requested that everyone introduce himself or herself. With that, each person stated his or her name and affiliation.

Mr. Creighton noted that if a participant wanted to provide a written statement but did not bring one to the workshop, they could send such a statement as an e-mail attachment to the Corps “national challenges” website (<http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/waterchallenges>). The information generated during the session would be compiled in a report, which would be provided to all registered participants and posted on the Corps’ website for others to review. Once all the sessions were complete, a national water resource challenge report would be developed and presented to decision-makers of the Nation to plan for future water resource needs.

Following these instructions, the participants were then asked to assign a spokesperson for the table group, independently write down the challenges each felt the Nation faced, and then go around the table group and discuss the challenges.

Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1st Group Discussion)

The participants were grouped into four tables of approximately six to eight people per table. After approximately an hour of discussion, Mr. Creighton went around the room and asked the spokesperson from each table to give a concise statement of the challenge or challenges identified by the participants at the table. While one member of the Corps staff projected onto a screen each challenge as it was identified, other Corps staff wrote each challenge on a separate piece of butcher paper, each of which were then affixed to a wall of the conference room. The workshop participants identified 21 separate challenges:

- A. Restoration of degraded environment and maintenance of aquatic habitats.
- B. Need to change or redefine the cost/benefit ratio policy (especially in rural areas) (more equity for low-income areas).
- C. Implementing the backlog of authorized but unfunded (\$25 Billion) projects (safety, navigation).
- D. Lack of adequate engineering and environmental data to make good decisions (accurate maps, permafrost, coastline).

- E. Sanitation and water supply – how does Corps coordinate with other organizations to produce adequate improvements (cultural differences).
- F. Need for small and large marine transportation systems.
- G. Delivery of projects (e.g. navigation) as efficient and effective as other transportation systems.
- H. Planning and development of infrastructure projects and importance of interagency planned development – “who is in charge?”
- I. Attention needs to be focused more on environmental resource base rather than population / cultural issues.
- J. Restructuring cost sharing formulas for smaller sponsors and include feasibility studies.
- K. Marine transportation system – increase public awareness on the value of this transportation system.
- L. Provide adequate infrastructure so infrastructure can keep up with economic growth and still conserve the environment and manage water resources.
- M. Updating floodplain maps – Poor quality in Alaska.
- N. Coastal and riverine erosion and flooding.
- O. Program and planning objectives that include regional economic development; include well being of the people.
- P. It is time to understand what is destroying Alaskan environment is occurring now – requires better understanding processes.
- Q. What is Corps role in clean up of contaminated abandoned sites (including mining sites).
- R. When and how can Corps participate in water export to regions in need of water.
- S. Dam removal to open up aquatic sites and ensure dam safety.
- T. Water and sewer infrastructure – some are old and need to be replaced (Physical facilities).
- U. Corps needs to aid and assist local planning capability.

After the last challenge was identified, Mr. Creighton thanked the group and advised the audience that at any time during the day they were welcome to fill out the “stickies” for any challenge of personal interest and stick it on the appropriate banner for that challenge, for as

many challenges as they wished. A transcription of the comments written on the “stickies” is provided in Appendix A.¹

Mr. Creighton then explained to the group that each challenge identified by the audience was important to the Corps and would be included in the meeting report. However, due to time constraints and a limited amount of participants, only three challenges would be addressed in detail during the second portion of the session.

Next, all of the participants were asked to vote on all of the challenges using adhesive dots in order to identify which challenges each felt were of most concern in general. Sheets of adhesive dots were placed on each table. Each non-Corps workshop participant then took five dots and affixed them to the challenge or challenges of most interest to him or her. The five dots could be distributed in any way the individual saw fit, such as one dot per challenge or all five dots on a single challenge. The number of dots for each challenge was then tallied and the totals written on each challenge sheet. The dots beside each lettered challenge were distributed as follows:

A	14	H	1	O	0
B	9	I	0	P	1
C	7	J	5	Q	2
D	10	K	0	R	0
E	0	L	5	S	0
F	4	M	1	T	6
G	7	N	0	U	0

The three challenges with the most dots were selected for additional discussion. The three challenges most favored by the audience were:

A	(14 votes)	Environmental Restoration
D	(10)	Lack of Environmental/Engineering Data
B	(9)	Modify Cost/Benefit Ratio Policy

Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2nd Group Discussion)

After the participants returned from the break, Mr. Creighton explained the format for the remainder of the afternoon. The three main challenges were written on butcher pads and positioned around the room (one challenge per butcher pad). A one-hour discussion period would be designated to allow for the challenges to be examined and for solutions to be developed. The participants would have the opportunity to discuss in detail one of the challenges that interested them by sitting at the table next to the appropriate butcher pad. In the event they

¹ The authors of this report made every effort to accurately transcribe the handwritten comments from the “stickies” generated by the listening session participants; however, some comments may contain errors due to illegibility or incoherence of the original text.

wanted to participate in a different challenge discussion, they were free to switch from one challenge to another during the discussion period. The facilitator asked for one volunteer to remain next to each butcher pad throughout the discussion and serve as the moderator and spokesperson for that discussion. This person would record the participant's ideas and suggestions for that challenge on the butcher pad.

Before commencing, some questions were posed to the group, and the participants were asked to develop the answers to these questions during their discussions. The answers would then be reported out to the entire audience at the end of the second discussion session. The questions were:

Assume you have the authority to implement the changes you would like to see. Discuss within your group:

- a. What actions would you take?
- b. Who should do it?
 - i. Role of the federal government
 - ii. Role of the State or local governments
 - iii. Role of private individuals or organizations

Audience members then gravitated into groups around the butcher pads (one challenge per butcher pad) and began deliberating with others in their group. A volunteer notetaker at each group took notes on the butcher pads for each of the three chosen challenges. The discussion session went from approximately 4:00 to 5:00. At the end of the discussion, Mr. Creighton asked the participants to provide any written statements to the session recorder and post any additional "stickies" they may have filled out. The spokesperson for each challenge group was asked (1) to restate the challenge they discussed, and (2) provide a summary of the discussion and the answers to the questions. The results of the discussions on the challenges are provided below²:

Challenge A – Environmental Restoration

What Action Should be Taken?

- Regulatory program approach (CWA-404).
 - Maintain the enforcement program.
 - Have adequate program funding.
 - Make priority of Corps mission.
 - Add research and development to mission.
 - Train and educate (i.e., positive public outreach).
- Corps needs to keep process focussed and not hand off to local agencies.
- Corps needs to maintain adequate staffing.
- Modify cost share ratios.

² The challenges are listed in the order of priority from the dot voting in the first group discussion, rather than in actual order of presentation.

- 206 (65% federal portion/35% local portion)
- 1135 (75%/25%)
- Have community involvement in projects.
- Make local expertise available for restoration assistance in local communities.
- Add expert assistance to the Corps mission in Alaska.
- Corps needs to conduct regional demonstrations on restoration and rehabilitation projects.
- Support a network for local/owner projects.
- Provide a web page that includes a list of experts' successful demonstration projects.
- Develop "one stop" for small business assistance.
- Provide community liaison as local contact.
- Be kinder, gentler, and show empathy during small projects.
- Participate in local comprehensive planning regarding water resources.
- Need a funding element.
- Have multi-disciplinary involvement.
- Develop adequate baseline data to define the problem.

Who Should Take Action?

- Mainly Corps.
- Include additional Federal and State agencies.
- Community groups.
- Private Industries.

Challenge D – Lack of Environmental/Engineering Data

What Action Should be Taken?

- Review existing data, data collection processes ongoing, and GIS applications.
- Identify data gaps and methods to improve (i.e., data quality objectives).
- Prioritize needs and establish timelines and initiatives (funding).
- Identify entities to collect data, such as public agencies, private sector, universities, and community entities.
- Create partnerships and have a data clearinghouse.
- Evaluate and apply new technologies.
- Coordinate data gathering efforts.
- Interagency leadership to complete actions above.

Who Should Take Action?

- Federal and State and local agencies.
- Some private industry.
- Academic groups.

Challenge B – Modify Cost/Benefit Ratio

What Action Should be Taken?

- Work with congressional delegation to change Corps policy by Water Resource Council.
- Develop more liberal interpretation of law like NRCS did in WRDA 86.
- Change law (WRDA 86) to be more flexible.
- Revive the Water Resources Council to include local policy for region rather than national scale.
- Need an increased level of funding to implement projects (tremendous backlog).
- Develop a mechanism that allows for a special provision (because of large coastline/land area) for rural areas of Alaska.
- Include the output by the seafood industry and national wetland values in the criteria.
- Increase funding based on a geographic basis.
- Focus on bringing the Nation to a basic infrastructure level.
- Legislative modifications need to be implemented by the executive branch and change language to be a “directive.”
- Need response from Alaska District Corps on AFN Resolution 99-48 and meetings.
- Cost/benefit needs to include life and health safety, unemployment, under employment, and subsistence not evaluated like recreation.
- Corps should reevaluate guidelines.
- Highway guidelines need to include public uses, not just industrial use.
- Unemployment/underemployment benefits need to be included as primary benefits (not just after the benefit/cost ratio is greater than one).
- Unemployment benefits need to be calculated on a local level rather than for the region (i.e. one large community can adversely effect all the small outlying communities).
- OMB needs to become more liberal on the ability to pay and extend this to additional authorities.
- Interagency needs to work together so each agency can contribute a smaller share.
- Use piece-meal approach to get a larger project.

Who Should Take Action?

- Alaska Foundation of Natives (AFN) involvement.
- Congress.
- Alaska legislature.
- Tribal entities.
- Federal court.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

As a final order of business, Mr. Creighton reminded the participants they would receive a copy of the report in a few weeks or they could also view it on the Corps website. Additionally, he asked the participants to fill out comment sheets if they had not already done so

and leave them with the Corps staff.³ Lastly, he reminded the participants to write down any additional remarks or challenges on the stickies and to post them on specific challenges before departing.

In closing, General Castro felt that although the attendance was modest, the outcome and discussions were representative and similar to the Honolulu session and other sessions across the nation. He recognizes that the region requires special recognition for project needs, and he let the participants know that the Corps was very sensitive to these issues. General Castro noted to the participants that POD is actively working issues regarding benefit to cost ratios and ability to pay. He stated that we need to pursue this issue not only from a Pacific Islands and Alaska point of view, but also from a National perspective. General Castro noted that there are other communities throughout the nation that have similar concerns with small economies and small populations but with equally valid quality of life problems. General Castro repeated to the participants that the information obtained during the session would be brought back to Washington for review. The challenges identified during the session are of a national concern. Lastly, General Castro thanked everyone for his or her involvement. The current objective of the Corps was to listen to the challenges facing the Nation and determine the regional needs in respect to the Nation. The workshop was then adjourned. The public statements collected in conjunction with this listening session are included as Appendix B.

³ In order to obtain feedback for internal use by the Corps on the effectiveness of the listening sessions, Corps personnel placed comment forms on each table for the participants to complete. These were collected by the Corps personnel as the participants left the meeting.

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTION OF COMMENTS REGARDING IDENTIFIED CHALLENGES

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ANCHORAGE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge A		
Restoration of degraded environment and maintenance of aquatic habitats.		
1	Giving water resources an emphasis in and of itself and not as part of another program.	Water issues challenge the Nation; supplies are limited; demands are competing and solutions have most.
2	Protection and restoration of our urban wetlands and waterways; urban non-point pollution.	Increased quantity of life; difficult.
3	Change philosophy of dilution is solution to pollution, for all agencies.	Cumulative effects are not considered.
4	Restoration of river systems affected by mining activity.	River and coastal wetlands need to last forever; we only have a limited amount.
5	Inclusion of wetlands (as the third item) following the necessity for flood control (second item) presents two somewhat conflicting arguments. Why not save more wetlands, using proven bio-engineering techniques, and reduce flooding at the same time? It's also more cost-effective than traditional gabion baskets, etc.	Important because 1) flood protection, as currently practical, is often not effective and 2) current practices for flood control often contribute to continued wetland loss.
6	Maintaining wetlands and open spaces.	Quality of life, species diversity, water quality.
7	Restoration of degraded aquatic habitat.	Maintain and increase fish species for use; water quality improvement.
8	Conservation of water quantity of Alaska's inland waters. Especially in national wildlife refuges.	To preserve fish/wildlife habitat. Ensure continued 1) health of Biota 2) subsistence use, and 3) recreational hunting/fishing.
9	Maintain high water quality of Alaska's inland waters, especially in NWRs.	Threats potential development –e.g. place money; hydroelectric development. Need to maintain integrity of water through out refuge.
10	Urban pollution of creeks from storm water/non-point-source origin.	Not well regulated; difficult to identify sources of pollution.
Challenge B		
Need to change or redefine the cost/benefit ratio policy (especially in rural areas)(more equity for low income areas)		
11	Cost/benefit, planning, construction; reactive, not proactive.	
12	Cost-benefit policy prevents needed projects for villages. Change cost-benefit policy to protect community in rural Alaska.	

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ANCHORAGE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
13	Quality of life is more than a benefit/cost ratio with intangible benefits/costs.	
Challenge C		
Implementing the backlog of authorized but unfunded \$25B of projects. (safety, navigation)		
14	Implementing the backlog (\$20 million) in projects. For Alaska we have \$50 million on the shelf-Ports and Harbors charting needs in Alaska are also backlogged. River bank and coastal erosion, water and sewer needs.	The backlog is growing, the problem is getting worse each year. For charting, safety and environmental damage are a major concern.
Challenge D		
Lack of adequate engineering and environmental data to make good decisions (accurate maps, permafrost, coastline)		
15	Lack of adequate environmental & engineering database (baseline) in Alaska. Needed to make “informed” decision. There is a greater level of uncertainty than compared to the lower 48.	To effectively plan and address the water resource challenges.
16	Charts- many charts in Alaska are based on old technology and old data (pre-earthquake).	Safe navigation in this harsh environment.
17	Permitting on wetlands; clean water (sewer systems in rural Alaska); planned development of infrastructure and the impacts to H2O; coordination between agencies.	
Challenge E		
Sanitation and water supply- how does Corps coordinate with other organizations to produce adequate improvements (cultural differences)		
18	Sanitation and water supply in arctic conditions for rural communities and villages. Work with USW, HIS, ANTHC, APLA , other native/tribal groups to develop consensus.	Engineering and cost of systems without economics to support the systems.
19	Improve “third world” sanitation conditions in many of the small rural communities.	Improve public health.
20	Many communities lack adequate water and sewer system.	Improve third world sanitation.
21	How do a hundred people afford a high cost quality mandate and system.	Mandate and technology.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ANCHORAGE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
22	Maintaining adequate water quantity in Alaska waterbodies.	
23	Inadequate water and sewer systems in the rural areas of Alaska.	Health and sanitation is poor in some areas.
Challenge F		
Need for small and large marine transportation systems		
24	Transportation (port) development	Great mineral wealth in Alaska is largely undevelopable due to transportation constraints.
25	Need for navigation improvements.	With many communities situation along coasts or rivers-loss of navigability causes economic hardship to residents.
26	No roads access to many communities.	Expensive air transport or slow barges are the only way to get people/goods to communities.
27	Access to open water; can only use boats when tide is high.	People use the water to access subsistence foods.
Challenge G		
Delivery of (e.g. navigation) projects as efficient and effective as other transportation systems		
28	Delivery of navigation projects as efficient and as effective as other public transportation project delivery system.	For the efficient use of limited resources, satisfy public expectations and timely delivery of project benefits.
29	Port facilities for small rural communities.	Health and safety economics.
30	The Corps of Engineers as a water resource environmental planning organization. Implemented with major emphasis on (not solely) engineering solutions.	The Corps of Engineers is the premier water resource planning organization. Its planning and design role/organization can contribute greatly in non-structural solutions.
31	Port and harbor maintenance and construction.	Increase availability of space for economic development; maintenance of current investment.
Challenge H		
Planning and development of infrastructure projects importance if interagency planned development- who is in charge		
32	1) Watershed planning from a resource and resource use base. With resources evaluated through functions and values (values to include tangible and intangible resources). 2) Who has the lead? The Corps of Engineers should be a co-lead. The Corps of Engineers can contribute through its water resource planning	Watershed direction- provided by presidential guidelines. “Conservation” means wise use of resources for current and future generations.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ANCHORAGE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
	procedure. The Corps of Engineers should not be the sole lead.	
33	Continued loss of watershed systems due to increasing development; wetlands and floodplains.	
34	“Thinking out of the box” to solve engineering/non-engineering problems. In maintaining and improving the “Quality of Life.” Quality criteria are more than just a benefit/cost ratio. (All too often the Corps of Engineers seek engineering solutions, rather than through the use of multi-discipline approach).	Incorporation and effective use of multi-disciplinary (physical, biological, and social) specialist in equal conjunction with the engineering specialist to provide innovative solutions, and strengthening community involvement.
Challenge I		
Attention be focused more on environmental resource base rather than population/cultural issues		
35	3 equals Corps of Engineers approach to Alaska. Alaska is 1/16 of Corps of Engineers districts, but 1/3 of nations fresh water and ____% nation’s wetlands.	Need more effort applied to the regions of Alaska. Need more financial resources to manage the resources and address issues. Do more listening sessions at 1) AFN conference 2) Environmental and Health Conference.
Challenge J		
Restructuring cost sharing formulas for smaller sponsors including feasibility studies		
36	Reduce community matching grant for feasibility study. Current match requires communities to secure 50%. Most rural villages cannot secure matching grants.	
Challenge K		
Marine trans. system – increased public awareness of value transportation system		
37	Raise public awareness of the value to each citizen of the MTS so public support produces the appropriate response from the government.	NO money, no change.
Challenge L		
Provide adequate infrastructure so infrastructure can keep up with economic growth and still conserving the environment and managing the water resource		
38	Ports are needed to ship resources (zinc, lead, copper, coal) out to markets.	Can not economically mine and ship these resources without ports.
39	Increasing use of water resources for economic development, tourism.	

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ANCHORAGE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
40	Balance infrastructure development with environmental protection.	States’ economic future is dependent upon infrastructure development, conflicting agency standards/policies. Lower 48 standards applied to the arctic and subarctic.
41	Need adequate small boat harbors statewide.	Vessels are being delayed and damaged due to overcrowding at existing harbors.
Challenge M		
Updating floodplain maps - Poor quality in Alaska		
42	Updating floodplain maps for communities.	Property loss minimization; plan development to avoid impacts.
Challenge N		
Coastal and riverine erosion and flooding		
43	Erosion at village sites.	Many rural Alaska villages are situated along rivers or coastlines. Erosion as a natural event often threatens infrastructure, homes, airstrips, sewage lagoons, etc. Loss of infrastructure = loss of economic viability.
44	Seasonal flooding continues to threaten Alaska’s infrastructure. How to manage very shallow water table; groundwater a special issue.	One certain example: rich soils versus soil rich ; Another certain example: permafrost.
45	Flooding: riverine and coastal.	A number of Alaskan communities are subject to annual flood conditions during breakup. This creates concerns for infrastructure protection and public health.
46	Bank erosion is damaging many communities.	Community infrastructure and homes are being damaged by erosion.
47	Erosion; contain erosion; protect community infrastructure, private and public property and human life.	
48	Coastal erosion at several communities.	Damages to infrastructure and homes.
Challenge O		
Program and planning objectives that includes regional economic development; include well-being of the people		
49	Program and planning objectives that include enhancing regional economic development and the well-being of people, and national economic development criteria.	For our state: purely economic planning objectives do not satisfy our needs.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ANCHORAGE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
50	Initiating and implementing multi-agency cooperation efforts to maximize effectiveness of limited resources (“bigger bang for the buck”).	Minimize duplication of effort.
51	The time to understand what is damaging Alaska’s environment and what do; we need to mitigate it.	We simply have no data.
Challenge P		
It is time to understand what is destroying Alaskan environment is now- better understanding processes		
52	Become a productive agency.	Less dollars in the long-term; good for all involved; improves communities; require data prior to project inception.
Challenge Q		
What is Corps role in clean up of contaminated abandoned sites (including mining sites)		
53	Groundwater contamination from abandoned sites.	Remote locations difficult to identify/monitor. Future water uses not necessarily known; impact to fish and wildlife.
54	Building enough consensus/agreement.	Inability to act. Because of the nature of government agencies’ roles, the public is looking/hoping agencies will take the lead for creating process that do build agreement, not serve to divide communities.
55	Water quality policies, programs, funding and activities need integration (more than coordination) with contaminated site cleanup.	Many (most) watershed efforts seem to be forming where contaminants are perceived as an issue. Those people working in smaller communities wear both hats- watershed and contamination cleanup. Lack of agency integration is confusing/frustrating and costly for them.
Challenge R		
When and how can Corps participate in water export to regions in need of water		
56	Water expert from Alaska.; up coming industry- what will the Corps role be?; storage and transportation facilities.	
Challenge S		
Dam removal and open up aquatic sites, dam safety		
57	Dam removal/opening aquatic species migratory path; dam safety, operation, flooding.	Reconnecting isolated habitat for fish; increasing fish species numbers for recreational use.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ANCHORAGE LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge T		
Water and sewer infrastructure – some are old and need to be replaced (Physical facilities)		
58	Lack of any modern water and sewer infrastructure is a community.	Health and social concerns are elevated by this condition.
59	Aging water/sewer infrastructure in rural Alaska communities.	Health and life safety reasons also lack of modern infrastructure limits economic growth.
Challenge U		
Corps needs to aide and assist local planning capability		
60	There is a need for planning assistance by Corps for all these issues.	Success relies primarily on sound planning.

APPENDIX B

SUBMITTED PUBLIC STATEMENTS AND MATERIALS

